

NITED STATE DEPARTM

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 09/043,268 05/07/98 VAN KESSEL L 294-44 · EXAMINER IM22/0810 RONALD J BARON WALLS, D HOFFMAN & BARON ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 350 JERICHO TURNPIKE JERICHO NY 11753 1731 **DATE MAILED:**

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

08/10/99



, Applica

Advisory Action

Application No. 4

Dionne A. Walls

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

1731

Van Kessel et al.



THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)] a) |X| expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above. Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a). Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Jul 30, 1999 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance: X The proposed amendment(s): will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief. in will not be entered because: they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below). they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below). they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: See Attachment. Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons as set forth in the Final Office Action dated May 23rd, 1999. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. Kill For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: 11 Claims rejected: 1-10 and 12-20 ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ ☐has ☐has not been approved by the Examiner. □ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). □ Other

Attachment

The protein-degrading agent/starch-degrading agent groupings are limited to a combination of two components (i.e. APS/protease). However, the phrase "or a combination thereof" creates new issues under 35 USC 112, 1st and 2nd paragraphs because it is not clear if the specification supports combinations of groups of two components nor is it clear if this type of combination is actually intended. Additionally, applicant has amended the claims to include subject matter that has not been previously claimed (specifically, the APS/amlyase grouping).

PETER CHIN PRIMARY EXAMINER